

App. No.: 10/065541  
Filed: October 29, 2002  
Conf. No.: 7669

Page 5 of 5

### REMARKS

The Examiner's action and correction of applicants' attorney's election is appreciated.

Turning to the Examiner's art rejections, his positions are well taken. It is well known that at least some of the structures disclosed in this application have been employed to reduce cogging torque, but always to applicants' knowledge this was done to effect the reduction when power was being applied. Applicants, to their knowledge, have been the first to recognize that these structures can be very effective to reduce the vibrations that occur in electric starting motors that occur not when electrical power is being applied, but after the supply is discontinued. The claims have been amended to emphasize this.

Having realized this for the first time, it is not unexpected that others would feel that this was obvious using the very effective expedient of hindsight reasoning. However the Examiner is most respectfully requested to try to erase this from his memory and look to see if any of the cited art suggests that vibrations during coasting of the motor to stop was disclosed. It is submitted that the art does not teach this. Further it is submitted that since the problem was well known and that no one before applicants realized that this solution to the problem was possible, that the invention, though admittedly obvious in retrospect, is nevertheless patentable. Like all significant inventions the solution may be obvious in retrospect, but its elegant simplicity bespeaks of patentability.

Therefore the Examiner is most respectfully requested to reconsider his positions regarding obviousness.

Respectfully submitted:



Ernest A. Beutler  
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182  
Pacific Time